REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the present application is respectfully requested.

Acknowledgement of Domestic Priority Claim

The present application claims priority from U.S. Application No. 08/998,583, filed December 29, 1997.

Because item 15 on the Office Action Summary of the Office Action is not completed and because the Office Action does not otherwise acknowledge this domestic priority claim, Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgement of this domestic priority claim in the next Office Action.

Request for Examiner Approval of Prior Submission of Proposed Drawing Corrections

On September 24, 2001, Applicant filed a Submission of Proposed Drawing Corrections for the Examiner's approval.

Because item 11 on the Office Action Summary of the Office Action is not completed and because the Office Action does not otherwise address whether these drawing corrections are approved, Applicant respectfully requests approval of these drawing corrections in the next Office Action.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-46 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent Application No. 08/998,583 ("parent application").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

M.P.E.P. § 804 (Ed. 8, Aug. 2001) states:

> A double patenting rejection of the obviousness type is "analogous to [a failure to meet] the nonobviousness requirement of 35 U.S.C. 103" except that the patent principally underlying the double patenting rejection is not considered prior art. *In re Braithwaite*, 379 F.2d 594, 154 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1967). Therefore, any analysis employed in an obviousness-type double patenting rejection parallels the guidelines for analysis of a 35 U.S.C. 103 obviousness determination. *In re Braat*, 937 F.2d 589, 19 USPQ2d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).
>
> Since the analysis employed in an obviousness-type double patenting determination parallels the guidelines for a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection, the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 are employed when making an obvious-type double patenting analysis. These factual inquiries are summarized as follows:
>
> (A) Determine the scope and content of a patent claim and the prior art relative to a claim in the application at issue;
>
> (B) Determine the differences between the scope and content of the patent claim and the prior art as determined in (A) and the claim in the application at issue;
>
> (C) Determine the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and
>
> (D) Evaluate any objective indicia of nonobviousness.
>
> The conclusion of obviousness-type double patenting is made in light of these factual determinations.
>
> Any obviousness-type double patenting rejection should make clear:
>
> (A) The differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims — a claim in the patent compared to a claim in the application; and
>
> (B) The reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim in issue is an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim in the patent.

The Office Action states:

> * * * Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a bus system comprising a map of virtual addresses of bus devices to their corresponding physical addresses.

Applicant respectfully submits this conclusion of obviousness is improper. Applicant respectfully submits the Office Action does not identify any differences between the claims in the present application and those in the parent application. Applicant also respectfully submits the Office Action does not identify any reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude the claims in the present application are obvious variations of the claims in the parent application.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits this rejection has been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e), 103(a) over Adamson

In paragraph 5 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, claims 1-9, 11-21, 23-29, 31-37, 39-44, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,761,448 to Adamson et al. ("Adamson").

In paragraph 7 on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 10, 22, 30, 38, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adamson.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

Independent claim 1 features a map of a virtual address to a physical address for a bus device on a bus.

Independent claim 13 features mapping a virtual address to a physical address for a bus device coupled to a bus.

Independent claim 25 features mapping a virtual address to a physical address for a bus device in a dynamically configurable bus system.

Independent claims 33 and 40 feature mapping a virtual address for a bus device to a physical address therefor.

Applicant respectfully submits Adamson did not teach or suggest these features.

Applicant respectfully submits the PCI Bus Mapping Table and the Logical-to-Physical Map Table of Adamson map logical to physical bus numbers for buses and not virtual to physical addresses for bus devices as claimed in independent claims 1, 13, 25, 33, and 40.

Noting claims 2-12, 14-24, 26-32, 34-39, and 41-46 depend from claim 1, 13, 25, 33, or 40, Applicant therefore respectfully submits these rejections have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

MARKED UP VERSION OF AMENDMENTS

No claims have been amended, canceled, or added.

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to help expedite any further prosecution of the present application.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any fees or fee deficiencies under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 in connection with this communication to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN, L.L.P.

Date: March 4, 2002

Matthew C. Fagan
Registration No. 37,542

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

Telephone: (512) 330-0844
Facsimile: (512) 330-0476